



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Viewed in its entirety, the book is a very painstaking, scholarly treatment of this subject, and should be very useful to those who are interested, in an intensive way, in the philosophical presuppositions of the theological thought of this period.

HEBBERD, S. S. *The Philosophy of the Future*. New York: The Maspeth Publishing House, 1911. 251 pages.

The purpose of this book is to demonstrate the existence of God, theistically conceived, by means of the fundamental principle that "the sole, essential function of all thinking . . . is to discriminate between cause and effect." Various metaphysical topics are discussed, such as space, time, causality, concept, and judgment, and these are followed by a chapter on induction which is, in the main, exceptionally good. Freedom of the will is insisted upon, and the existence and immortality of the soul proved! About forty pages at the end are devoted to a discussion of criticisms passed upon the work by several American professors of philosophy to whom it was submitted in manuscript form.

The author is an interactionist in psychology and a "new realist" in philosophy, although he would probably insist upon his own interpretation of this latter term. He has devoted more than half a century to this work, which is stimulating in many respects. His criticisms of other writers are frequently acute but oftentimes too sweeping. On the whole, one is hardly convinced by his discussion. He has solved so many of the problems, practically all, which the greatest thinkers from Plato to Kant and the more recent scholars have struggled with in vain, that one becomes skeptical as to some of his contentions. To solve absolutely a single philosophical problem is to merit not a little praise from one's fellows; to solve them all is to raise a question as to the validity of the solutions found.

MENEGOZ, FERNAND. *Das Gebetsproblem in Anschluss an Schleiermachers Predigten und Glaubenslehre neugestellt und untersucht*. Leipzig: Hinrichs. 66 pages. M. 1.80.

The perennial significance and interest which attach themselves to the influence of Schleiermacher are evinced by this very welcome brochure on his attitude toward prayer. Here is presented first a very full summary of his teaching on the subject, set forth as far as possible in the chronological order of its appearance, drawn from his sermons from 1779 to 1833, and from the three editions of the *Glaubenslehre*, 1822, 1831, and 1836. This inquiry discloses the fact that with but a single exception his position remained fundamentally unchanged: influenced by his Spinozistic intellectualism he came at length to abandon the idea of a reciprocal activity between God and man. The criticism pro and con takes into consideration the origin and nature, the spirit and subject of prayer, together with Christology and the notion of God so far as they bear on this matter. Prayer is a social religious fact, resting for its spirit and content on the authority of Christ. The intention is so to define God and Christ as to satisfy the practical needs of evangelical piety. Whatever limitations characterize Schleiermacher's treatment of prayer on its positive side, as, for example, his inability to avail himself of the recent discoveries concerning prayer "in the name of Jesus," he has certainly touched the problem at its highest point. On the other hand, his position is here subjected to criticism on account of his rejection of the personality and freedom of God, of the metaphysical deity of Christ, prayer to Christ, material

good as object of prayer, definite wishes in prayer, on account, too, of his denial that prayer is heard, and his advocacy of determinism. We are twice reminded of the bond which united Schleiermacher with Kant, Hegel, Strauss, Robertson, Rousseau, and Feuerbach in a common antagonism to the scholastic notion of God, miracles, and prayer. Schleiermacher may be supplemented but he cannot be supplanted; this presentation will aid toward a better understanding both of his conception of prayer and of prayer in general.

SLATTERY, CHARLES LEWIS. *The Authority of Religious Experience*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1912. viii+299 pages. \$1.80 net.

Few men are so well qualified as is the gifted rector of Grace Church in New York to speak on behalf of the religious experience of Christians who are not specialists in the realms of theological scholarship. In this volume, embodying the lectures delivered on the Paddock Foundation at the General Theological Seminary in New York, the thesis is defended that a sound progress in Christian thinking and living can come only as general Christian experience as well as theological scholarship is allowed to make its contribution. Every scholar ought to be grateful for this interpretation of the sentiments of lay Christians as furnished to us by this large-minded pastor. The lectures give to us the point of view of "religious experience" concerning the Bible, the church, immortality, Jesus Christ, and God. In all cases we are assured of a tolerant and friendly attitude on the part of the layman toward technical research in the field of theology. But it is also somewhat humbling to the pride of the scholar to find that the layman does not take seriously some of the distinctions which seem to the scholar to be indispensable. For example, the critical inquiry as to the historical facts concerning Jesus—an inquiry which the scholar deems to be essential to a right belief concerning Jesus—is easily settled by the layman. "The fact is that devout people hear the voice of Christ in the Fourth Gospel as in no other book in the world" (p. 51). This feeling on the part of the layman cannot fail to "bring the Fourth Gospel very close to the traditional date and authorship" (p. 52). Here is an instance of deciding historical fact by an exercise of mere feeling, which, if indulged in by one who departed from the traditional conceptions, would be a subject for ridicule on the part of conservative clergymen. But why is it any better to decide *for* the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel on the basis of a "devout feeling" than it is to decide *against* it on the basis of literary or historical "feeling"?

It must be granted, however, that Dr. Slattery has called attention to an aspect of the process of development in Christian thinking which deserves more attention than it has received. There is undoubtedly a sad lack of co-operation between theological scholarship and popular religious experience. But co-operation can be secured only by a more critical analysis of the problem than is suggested by our author. "Experience" undoubtedly does have the ability and the right to a final judgment on matters of actual present religious life. It can unquestionably decide whether the utterances of the Fourth Gospel are more edifying to us than are those of the Synoptics. But to argue from this judgment to one concerning date and authorship is both confusing and aggravating. The fruitful and valuable plea for the rights of religious experience today made in this volume is entirely justified. But it should lead not to the indefensible position that conclusions of scholarship may be revised by the uncritical feelings of laymen; it should rather point to such a revision